

CONFIDENTIAL

OGC HAS REVIEWED.

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

10th Meeting

Thursday, 15 October 1953

4:00 p.m.

DCI's Conference Room

Administration Building

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

10th Meeting

Thursday, 15 October 1953

4:00 p.m.

DCI's Conference Room

Administration Building

In Attendance:

Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, Chairman

Matthew Baird

25X1A9A

Richard Helms

25X1

George E. Meloon

Huntington Sheldon

25X1A

John S. Warner

25X1A9A

Lawrence K. White

Executive Secretary

Secretariat

Reporter

CONFIDENTIAL

Security Information

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

. . . The 10th Meeting of the CIA Career Service Board convened at 4:00 p.m., 15 October 1953, in the DCI's Conference Room, Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick presiding . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't know how many of you have received from Mr. Warner the dossier, the final report from the Legislative Task Force, but it is going to require a fairly intensive amount of homework. I think the Legislative Task Force should be complimented on their excellent job. I think this is work which after it is once done won't have to be repeated. I think in view of the size of this report it wouldn't be fair to take it in one meeting.

We are going to have coming into us in the next couple of weeks the report of the Information Task Force. As you recall, they were writing the booklet: What A Career in CIA Means To You. I have their first draft. That will be available, I think, in the next week or so for general circulation, for comment and for ultimate approval. We will have the report of the Women's Panel. I think that is due the first of November. We will have the report of the Junior Officers Panel, which is also due 1 November. The Insurance Task Force should be coming up with a final report before too long.

25X1A9A

Yesterday Security said they estimated their clearances on the two actuaries would be due the middle of November. So we won't get underway until the middle of November on that. And then we will have two weeks of intensive work. Maybe 1 December for the Insurance Task Force.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Somewhere in there will be recommendations which I will personally sponsor to the Board on a complete revision of the system of the Career Service Program. I don't think there is any point in discussing it now except to say I think the present system is cumbersome, too time-consuming for Senior Executives, and also is over-burdening our administrative staffs, and I think it can be streamlined down to a far more effective system.

Now with all of those taken together we have a pretty full program for the balance of this year. I have set in my mind the goal, more or less, to try and see if we can get this whole career service program wrapped up by the end of the calendar year so that we can say to the Director: "Here it is. This is the way it should work. Everybody in the Agency now knows what it means to them. You have our recommendations on legislation." And so on.

With that preamble I would simply like to say that I would like to call a meeting for every Thursday from now until we can tie this up. We will

Security Information

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

① try to restrict these meetings to one hour. Consequently, I would like the Board members to read pretty thoroughly the items on the agenda before the meetings so we can get comments and have them concise and to the point, and get the work out of the way.

② The first item on today's agenda is the minutes of the 9th meeting of the Board held August 23. You received them, I believe, with your copy of the agenda. Are there any comments or corrections on these minutes? I then assume it is the substance of the Board they stand approved as presented.

③ Item two is of a similar nature. It is the review of activities of the Steering Group, Memorandum for the Record dated 1 October 1953, which is Tab 2 in your agenda. This, as you have noted, concerns the general discussion of the National Security Medal and other medals. Are there any corrections or amendments to that report? Does anyone wish to raise any question concerning paragraph 9? Paragraph 9 is the suggestion that the Incentive Awards Committee and the Honor Awards Board be merged.

MR. BAIRD: You said not.

25X1A9A

[]: What paragraph?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Paragraph 9. The decision was that they should not be merged. Any question about that decision?

MR. MELOON: I was all for merging at one time but our Incentive Awards Committee is so busy and we are snowed under anyway, and I don't think it would be advisable, from a work standpoint, for them merging now.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then can we consider that issue closed for the foreseeable future?

Item 3 is the selection of a rotating member of the Board to succeed

25X1A9A

④ [] whose term expired 30 September. I believe nomination was up to Mr. Helms and Mr. Helms nominated [] who is here present. So we will welcome M [] successor.

25X1A9A

. . . Off the record . . .

⑤ MR. KIRKPATRICK: Item 4 is the continuation of a prior item, the approval of the Career Development Slot Status Report.

25X1A9A

[] do you want to give the Status Report?

You have my papers, Kirk. May I borrow them?

I think you have all read the Status Report. Those in paragraph a

Security Information

are approved and are slotted in career development slots. Those names in paragraph b were tentatively approved at the last meeting subject to the approval of the DD/P that slots were available. [] has said that slots are 25X1A9A available for six of these nine, namely, those in NE which are in Training Program "A"; and he has said that slots are not necessary for the other three, 25X1A9A namely, []. The Board went over the qualifications and reasons for these career development slots at the last meeting, so I suggest we just have confirmation of the action that the six are approved for career development slots.

MR. MELOON: I have the following information on [] in 25X1A9A paragraph a. [] is a supergrade and the way that paper is written 25X1A9A it would appear as though it indicated a replacement would be needed in [] 25X1A9A [] case during his tenure in this career development slot. DD/I does not have a vacancy under the supergrade ceiling at the present time. It was not clear in that paper as to whether or not they intended to move somebody into [] job at the Grade 16 level or not. So when it went through 25X1A9A Personnel I put my concurrence on it with the understanding that this did not create another supergrade without concurrence of the Director for a ceiling vacancy. I don't think that that was considered by the Board when they passed on that career development slot. As the paper is written I am not sure whether or not you put a man into that grade.

MR. SHELDON: [] At the present time we have no ceiling 25X1A9A for that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It does create a problem.

MR. HELMS: In other words, [] is not a supergrade so it doesn't 25X1A9A create a problem.

MR. SHELDON: [] blocks that slot even while he is away.

MR. WARNER: It blocks the supergrade slot.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It blocks the supergrade one.

[] That was one of the ground rules the Board developed, 25X1A9A that career development slots would not imply any change in the ceilings. It was in Mr. Kirkpatrick's memorandum of 7 August.

MR. MELOON: It's in the proposed amendment, which is Item 5.

MR. WHITE: Actually I don't know what else we can do. The supergrade thing is an entirely different situation.

Security Information

SECRET

MR. MELOON: The way the paper is written it does leave room for approval by this Board for a replacement to go in there, and it didn't say whether it was at the supergrade level or not, so it conceivably could create a problem.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The way to resolve the thing is to make a commitment that you will make the grade for him when he comes back.

MR. WHITE: No matter where he is he counts against the ceiling. I would suggest that there isn't anything the Board can do about this. 25X1A9A

[] It's something for us to discuss on an administrative basis.

MR. WHITE: If you have somebody you want to promote then we will have to take that up as a supergrade problem rather than a career development slot problem. 25X1A9A

MR. BAIRD: One minor correction. Those four people we have discussed, [] they shouldn't have TR as a career designation. They are in the DD/P complex. They are just in Training for that program. 25X1A9A

[] We will see that that is changed. 25X1A9A
May I suggest, then, that the Board approve those six slots for []
[] 25X1A9A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: All except the three that [] has wafted away from us. 25X1A9A

[] He saved us three slots. 25X1A9A
MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is there any objection to the approval? They stand approved.

What about paragraph c? 25X1A9A
[] These are all new and have not been before the Board before.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Would the Board like a discussion of the individual cases and why they are here? 25X1A9A
[] I have papers approved by the Career Board, by the Director of Personnel, and by the Director of Training recommending all of these, and their signatures are here.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The individual career boards have recommended in each instance?

SECRET

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

25X1A9A

5

[] The Director of Training has recommended that a slot be allocated, and the Director of Personnel has also recommended that a slot be allocated.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And what will this bring the total number of slots committed to?

25X1A9A

[]: Nineteen. Since we only approved six I think it's nineteen.

MR. HELMS: Why is this TSS fellow going to the University of Missouri? What is he going to study?

25X1A9A

[] isn't it? Here it is.

25X1A9A

. . . [] file was then handed to Mr. Helms for his perusal . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any questions on any of the others concerned?

Rud, do you have a quick breakdown of the allocation by major areas in the Agency of the career development slots? Now that's half? We have reached half of the number?

25X1A9A

[] Half--that is right. They are shown here.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, don't worry about it. I think with half gone we might take some careful looks to make sure that one side of the Agency doesn't walk away with all of them. Of course, if DD/A and some of the others aren't going to put in for them it's a matter of how much we want to protect their interests. Also, Rud, I think it would be useful if at an early meeting--not the next one but say next month--if we have an indication as to how long these slots are tied up for.

25X1A9A

[] I have the information here, and I thought in my monthly report I would show how long the slots are tied up, and also have a tabulation by career boards.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Mr. Helms, do you have any questions on []

25X1A9A

MR. HELMS: No.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is it the view of the Board to approve these slots? They stand approved.

Item 5 is the proposed amendment in the Career Service Program which covers the career development slots. Any questions on this Regulation?

MR. BAIRD: I suppose there is a reason why my signature is required on rotation loan slots and Meloon's is required on training slots, but I don't

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

see that there is much purpose served by that, Rud. In other words, if there is a rotation loan slot of a transfer or rotation between one office and another, I don't look upon that as a training matter at all. I don't see why I should have to concur. By the same token I don't see why George should be interested in the training.

25X1A9A

Don't put me in that spot, please.

MR. BAIRD: That seems to be an extra signature required and an extra couple of days for the thing to get from Curie Hall to I Building. I have no interest in a training loan slot.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Career development they are called now.

MR. BAIRD: That does not come to me as Director of Training.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would think you would have great interest. You would be interested only if training were actually involved?

6
MR. MELOON: I am very much interested, from the personnel standpoint, in these people going to these slots. We may have something from a correlation standpoint that should or might be brought to the attention of the Board. We may be pressed for a replacement by the Office, and they may have the problem of a military man being in the job at the same time. There could be any one of a dozen problems, but I would be interested in seeing that person is going to be out of that slot for a year or two.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think you are right on that.

MR. MELOON: We may be having people declared surplus in that very office, and these people going away to school. And if we were involved in a reduction-in-force we would take them out of the Reduction-in-Force Register. I could think of 15 or 20 reasons why I should see them. Whether or not I should have approval on them is something else. We may have a draft deferment on some of these individuals and the Career Service Board would be approving sending them away to school somewhere in this country, which is directly contrary to our policy.

MR. WHITE: Isn't the transfer or loan between the OCI and the OO -- isn't that an internal training problem? Shouldn't the Director have some one place to look to know how many people he has in training and where they are?

MR. BAIRD: I don't think that is training as such; not formal training, certainly.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Supposing they are career, basically. You would

SECRET
Security Information

yield?

MR. BAIRD: Oh, yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then we consider these approved as presented. 25X1A9A

[] That is approval of the career service program amendment which will then, Colonel White, go through the normal administrative channels for issuance, is that correct?

MR. WHITE: Correct.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Item 6 is proposed Regulation [] on which I 25X1A understand there are some disagreements.

25X1A9A [] My personal problem was that employees reading this letter come to the conclusion that they have the right . . . inaudible . . . and I think the language should be "minimum" time before they are in the promotion zone or considered for promotion.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I wonder if you gentlemen would like to discuss this, but I wonder if it is worthwhile? I sent in a two page nonconcurrence.

MR. WHITE: I didn't have a chance to read this until I read it in here for the first time, but the way it occurred to me when I read it is that this is really time-in-grade policy instead of promotion policy, and I think if we are talking about time-in-grade we ought to call it that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: There is another Regulation on promotion, I understand.

MR. WHITE: From my point of view I would prefer to have time to think this a little further before we try to do something about it.

25X1A9A [] The other one says you promote after 6 months after the guy is in the slot, which I violently oppose.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In view of the fact that some people have already gone into this, I think rather than discuss it any further here we should defer discussion, and if next Thursday it is the desire of the Board to get into the details of that, that would be fine.

My view is that it should definitely be stated in the Regulation that it is time-in-grade, because we have had too long in this Agency a general view that you serve your time and you get your automatic jump. That day is just over, because the top grades are getting "fillered" and "fillered." You are not going to be able to get them up there. I also feel quite strongly--and I would hate to toss this out as a subject for discussion now--but I feel quite

SECRET
Security Information

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

1
strongly that we are moving right into the phase where we have to get into competitive promotions in the senior grades, passed on by an Interagency Board. I think the sooner we move into that the fewer difficult personnel problems we are going to have. I toss that out as we withdraw Item 6 from the agenda.

Item 7 gets us to the honor awards again. We have here a definite proposal by the Honor Awards Board, I believe. [] is here today. 25X1A9A
Bob, do you have anything to say on this?

[] I don't think so, Kirk, if everyone has had a chance to 25X1A9A
read it. Perhaps they would like to fire some questions on this.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would like to point out this was pretty well covered in the discussion of the Steering Group, which is the paper dated 1 October and it's the second item in your packet there. 25X1A9A

8
[] I might explain the modification that has been made since that discussion of 30 August. At that time, as you recall, we thought in terms of three additional decorations. We have now brought our sights down to two additional decorations in order not to compete with the National Security Medal, which would still hold the number one position for outstanding intelligence effort. I think the degree of difference between the National Security Medal and a senior CIA medal would be so slight that it would be extremely difficult to judge cases for either one. Hence, we have brought the second decoration, which would be the number one CIA decoration, down to the point where it fills the gap and gives us a range of four, including the Medal of Freedom. Otherwise, in our initial proposal we were thinking in terms of different metals, gold, silver and bronze. Now we have discarded the difference in metals entirely. Now we are thinking of the National Security Medal as the top award for outstanding intelligence performance.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any comments on the proposal?

25X1A9A

[] Has anyone ever received a National Security Medal?

There have been three approved awards. There is no medal yet in creation to present, but there have been three awards approved.

MR. BAIRD: Will we hear about them?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Some we will hear about and others we won't. Some like General Smith, for example, we will hear about. But some are going to be awarded with a time barrier of an indefinite period, for security reasons, and we will just have to abide in silence.

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

SECRET
Security Information

MR. BAIRD: The CIA Career Service Board is really out of this picture?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It is my recommendation that we be out of it.

MR. BAIRD: We here would hear about them just as other Agency employees when an award was given and there were no security implications?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think for morale purposes they should be known whenever it can be done.

25X1A9A

[]: Would it be correct to say that the CIA Board is out of it for individual cases but in it for policy?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is the whole purpose of the Board.

MR. HELMS: Whatever happened about this issue of incentive awards versus honor awards?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: At the Steering Group meeting it was decided there should be two, honor awards and incentive awards.

MR. HELMS: Does that resolve the issue?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Not necessarily. Is there any further discussion of Item 7?

25X1A9A

8 [] If this proposal is accepted by the Board we have, for design purposes, some designs submitted by the Office of the Quartermaster General for the National Security Medal but which were not used for that purpose. I think we can examine those and perhaps select one or two that will be appropriate for this type of decoration.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Would you want to submit those to the Director through this Board or directly to the Director?

25X1A9A

[] I think through the Board. Inasmuch as you looked at the designs for the National Security Medal you might like to compare this with those.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: When those are ready I would suggest coming up and showing the Board the complete package right down the line with the criteria for the award of each medal, and then we can put that on the Director's desk so he will have the complete package.

MR. WHITE: I wonder, Kirk, if it would be worthwhile having it done to get the Director's approval in principle for the medals, because with General Smith we would fall flat on our face because he felt there was one and

SECRET
Security Information

only one. But I think we should get his approval on the principle.

25X1A9A

If he approved this Staff Study then we could proceed.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Why don't we get that approval? That can be done very quickly.

Any further discussion or comment on Item 7.

Item 8, and Mr. Helms you have the floor.

MR. HELMS: Does everybody know what this problem is? Briefly stated, it is this: If a civilian performs an extremely meritorious service can he be given a raise in pay as well as a decoration or must he take only one or the other? Stripped of all the verbiage that goes with it that is what it really boils down to. This has come up just recently. The DD/P Career Service Board gave two individuals a small in-grade raise on the basis of extremely fine performance in the field. At the same time it was recommended they be given a decoration. The Honor Awards Board disagreed with this policy and took the position that since they had also received an incentive award that took care of this particular service and it was not justified to also give them a decoration.

This matter was discussed one morning in the DD/P Career Service Board between the members of that Board and representing the Honor Awards Board, and that meeting broke up disagreed, the issues being fairly obvious and the sides these people took being fairly obvious. There were those present who said: "Why, if in the military you give a fellow a battlefield promotion and give a medal all at the same time, why can't you in civilian life give an in-grade raise and a decoration at the same time?" The Honor Awards Board doesn't agree with that approach and they think it should do one or the other depending on the type of performance, service, and so forth, and that the determination be made and settled on that basis. There is the case. It is clear to see who advocates which. Under the circumstances it was felt desirable, rather than discussing it to the point of exhaustion, that it be referred to this Board for resolution, or if it is too complicated and too much policy gets into this that the Board recommend to the Director what line should be taken. Is that a fair statement of the case?

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

Yes.

MR. BAIRD: And you have no recommendation?

MR. HELMS: As a member of the Board I presented the question as a member of the Career Service Board, and as a member of the Career Service

SECRET
Security Information

Board I do have a recommendation to make, and that would be that both be permitted. I don't see the point of making one or the other.

MR. WHITE: Isn't it true that a man might very well be eligible for a monetary award or in-grade raise or something for a suggestion which saved the Agency money, or this, that and the other, and he might at the same time never be eligible for a decoration for outstanding service? Just from what little thinking I have done just since this was raised here, it doesn't seem to me that one should preclude the other.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think the only issue at stake is: Can a man receive both simultaneously for the same act?

MR. MELOON: I'd like to point out that in the normal Government agency--and we are always taking the stand here that we are abnormal, over and above any other Agency--that in the Census Bureau a person could, under the present Regulation, get a medal and a salary increase for the same act, so I don't see why we should preclude it in this Agency.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is there any disagreement with that theory? There are three who have expressed the view that it is possible to receive both.

MR. WHITE: I'd like to hear the disagreement on it.

25X1A9A

9 [] We have done a little reading on the subject, particularly from the standpoint of attempting to trace a Governmental development along this line. In 1927 the principle was first enunciated in the Public Law that established the Distinguished Flying Cross that one award would be made for one deed. They were specific in the use of language and they said "one" decoration. The Hook Commission then took the matter under advisement but recommended against a monetary consideration of a continuing nature. In the case which Mr. Helms describes the in-grade raise is a continuing monetary consideration. We in the Honor Awards Board have taken the position that we are just at the inception of an honor awards program and we would not like to see a price set on our medals, and that by a simultaneous action of a cash grant or in-grade raise and the award of a medal we are creating an association that will be difficult to divorce once it is established.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't see how you can have a divorce before you have a marriage. This is not tying the two together, but in certain instances where a man is a junior officer in a small component where he can't be promoted

SECRET
Security Information

SECRET
Security Information

outright because of the T/O he can be given an in-grade raise under the jurisdiction we have available. But the fact that the two tie together in certain cases is no policy to tie them together all the time.

25X1A9A

[] You have an in-grade raise, you have a promotion in grade, and you have a medal, and you can get one of the two or two of the two but you don't have to get them all at the same time.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think the principle is fairly well established and I don't think anybody on this Board disagrees with you that there should not be any attempt to put money value on merit; in other words, if it were outstanding achievement in the line of duty and accomplishing something with definite benefit for the National interest, I don't think anybody wants to try and say: "Well, if you are going to do that you are going to get more cash." Because that isn't dedication to the service that we want to get at. I think we are saying in certain instances that it will be a very definite benefit to give a monetary return, just as a battlefield promotion and the Silver Star often go together.

25X1A9A

[] We took that up, too. That is given if there is a vacancy for it. So I think since word passes around this Agency with relative speed, the first case where a medal and a cash award have gone hand-in-hand is going to establish an association.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't think so, because it is pointed out to me that the Congressional Medal of Honor carries an annual stipend with it.

25X1A9A

[] No, it doesn't. It did until the Hook Commission's report was adopted. At the age of 65 a man who receives the Medal of Honor may have his name entered on the Medal of Honor Roll and he gets \$10.

MR. WHITE: If you prohibit the two from going together don't you automatically place a price on them, because then he has his choice of whether he gets \$100 or a medal.

25X1A9A

[] It won't be a matter of choice.

MR. WHITE: He wouldn't make the choice but somebody else would.

MR. WARNER: Are the criteria for one of these medals and the criteria for an in-grade increase the same?

[] What do you do with this medal when you get it?

25X1A9A

MR. HELMS: There isn't any medal so nobody has one.

SECRET
Security Information

SECRET
Security Information

MR. WARNER: I think if the criteria are the same that answers it.
How can you get it for the same act if the criteria aren't the same?

MR. WHITE: I don't think the recommendation should come forward together at all.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But you do admit it is conceivable they could come forward? Then I think we are jostling with the windmill. The Board seems to be almost in unanimous agreement that it is possible to give the two simultaneously.

MR. BAIRD: I think the policy ought to be that it be extremely rare that you do it.

. . . Off the record . . .

MR. BAIRD: I don't think the battle medal for promotion is comparable at all. The Distinguished Flying Cross never depended on whether a man got a promotion or not. He was deserving of promotion regardless of whether he got the medal.

25X1A9A

[]: It was assumed the criteria are different. The two need not be necessarily associated.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I recommend to the Board that the minutes reflect the fact the Board does not believe this is going to be precluded, but feels as a general policy should not go together except in rare and extraordinary circumstances.

MR. HELMS: The only thing that I am not keen on about that is the "extraordinary circumstances" because that gets you into some semantical question of how extraordinary they have to be.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Just strike that and say they should not go together and then you don't have any semantics to worry about.

25X1A9A [] I visualize that has to be done by the supervisor so it seems to me it should be left to the discretion of the Boards.

25X1A9A

MR. HELMS: [] here was an unusual sort of case and I will submit in evidence exactly what happened. There were two individuals in a field station. It so happened that due to the administrative peculiarities we have in this organization the senior man in the station was junior in pay to the fellow just under him. We desired, as a result of this particular business that came up, and because a good job was done, not only to give recognition

SECRET
Security Information

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

but also to straighten out that inequity; in other words, to make the chief the chief. But because the question which was up at the time was the fact that they had done a very good job and recognition should be given to it, the incentive thing came first and the recognition and award came second, and then it hung on this hook.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think we can take it off the hook by saying that one is a Board action and the other is an administrative action, and, generally speaking, never the twain will meet. Is that satisfactory?

MR. MELOON: In the future you ought to recommend the medal first and then the Incentive Awards Committee has no concern. (Laughter)

25X1A9A

MR. HELMS: Oh, George, I have learned.

That leads me to my last pitch on the subject. We are attempting to administer this honor awards program with a degree of conservatism at the outset. That is valuable advice passed on to us by all of the Services, to go slow when you are starting out. So we are determined not to make this a great give-away program from the initiation of it. There is no need, really, Dick, for the administrative action you describe to be brought to the attention of the Honor Awards Board at all. I decry they appeared to be simultaneous actions, but we have yet to see a recommendation on any of these men from the Division that is interested in having them recognized.

MR. MELOON: You could have added, Bob, they were brought up before the wrong tribunals.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That leads me into the new business. Mr. Warner has something that ties in fairly closely with this, don't you, John? That is the business of the authority to award the Medal of Freedom.

MR. WARNER: Yes, we were going to do some more research on that and I would like to run down the facts that are available, because as a matter of record there aren't too many available. But in connection with the Medal of Freedom, we did make a pitch with the Bureau of the Budget when that Medal was being devised to extend the authority so that the Secretary of Defense was named in there, and at that time the position in the Agency was that we did not want to have the DCI specifically named, and we would make arrangements with the Department of Defense so that they would award it to our people, and, if necessary, in certain cases, the Secretary of State could do it since it does extend to the Secretary of State. The next incident that occurred was

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

SECRET

Security Information

the National Security Medal which was purely a CIA affair from the very beginning. On that one, again, the position of the Agency was not to designate the DCI. We went to great pains to provide in the Executive Order that the President could designate such people as he wished. When it went forward for signature there was attached a classified confidential paper designating the DCI. That is past policy. So the question of now amending the Executive Order to specifically include the DCI seems to be inconsistent with at least two actions in the past. That was the basis on which we felt that it would be somewhat disturbing to drop this thing in the hopper of the Bureau of the Budget at this time.

MR. HELMS: Who wants the Medal of Freedom when you can get one of 25X1A9A

[] fancy jobs? 25X1A9A

[] When this was approved a year ago last August, Mr. 25X1A9A

[] said he felt we should use the Medal of Freedom for security reasons, 25X1A9A
and other medals like it, other medals available besides CIA medals, solely for security and cover reasons. That is one of the reasons that the concept of awarding the Medal of Freedom is alive, in order to maintain that position.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In clearing this whole problem with the Director why don't we ascertain his views on it, whether he wants to be inconsistent to go back to the White House and the Budget to amend that Executive Order, or if he wishes to go after it whether he would do something which I would personally go against--having a Secretary recommend. I think the Director himself can give us the answers to all of those and save considerable discussion, don't you?

MR. WARNER: I just caution that all the facts be put on the table.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If we want the Medal of Freedom that is something to which the Director can answer "yes" or "no"; and if we want it--I think I could almost speak for the Director--he would say: "Let's get it directly and say nothing to the Secretary of Army, Navy or Air Force, and ask for it." I think if we wanted the President to just amend the Executive Order he could say that the Director of Central Intelligence is now authorized . . .

MR. WARNER: That is the direct approach. 25X1A9A

[] I had a chance to discuss this informally with an acquaintance in the Bureau of the Budget. The chap's reaction certainly was not one that would inhibit us at all. I don't think it would ruffle the Bureau of the Budget.

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

25X1A9A

MR. WARNER: That is your opinion, Bob.

[] My opinion based on a conversation.

MR. WARNER: That is not ours. We can be wrong, but they don't feel like running up to the President every time we change our minds.

MR. WHITE: I am not clear in my mind--I know this was a strong personal feeling of General Smith's that he didn't want this National Security Medal--I don't know what reasoning process he went through to arrive at that decision.

MR. WARNER: We can't find anything on that.

MR. WHITE: General Smith wanted it this way, and, as John points out, he was quite specific that that is the way he wanted it. He did not want the authority to go to the Director. I wonder what the reasons were.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Suppose I take it up myself and get his views and we can save a lot of discussion.

25X1A9A

Item 9 is the approval of [] as a member of the CIA Honor Awards Board for the period ending 31 October 1954.

[] It's an extension of his term.

25X1A9A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any objection?

Now the new business. John, would you like to make your recommendations personally on the handling of this Legislative Task Force matter, and quickly, before Mr. Helms gets out?

MR. WARNER: Yes, I would. Procedurally I think it is too big a bite to take at one time. I would suggest breaking it down into logical patterns.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Items 1 and 2?

MR. WARNER: Not necessarily, Kirk. They weren't done that way. But I do believe we could send out an agenda and break them down logically.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Why don't we get that out quickly, with the request that each Board member come read up on two items of two specific subjects?

25X1A9A

[] Could you pick the first two now, John, so everybody knows? We will distribute the agenda for next Thursday's meeting on Monday, but it will help if everybody knows now what should be read before that meeting.

MR. WARNER: I think we could just as well take "C" and "D", and the over-all report itself. I think that goes to the heart of the question, whether we go after it or not.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: "C" and "D" being liberalized retirement. I think

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

we want to lick the ones that we may have to go after legislation for first.

MR. WARNER: That is the problem we are faced with. "C" and "D", including the report itself. I think everybody should at least read the over-all report and get the picture.

. . . Mr. Helms withdrew from the meeting . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That will be the order of business for next Thursday. That will be the main order of business, and if there are other matters of incidental importance we can dispense with those.

[] would like to know whether any members of the Board would like to have made available to them a copy of the Career Service Reference Book? Do you have it with you, Rud?

[] This is the book--this tome--which has background material and reference material on the career service program. These are ready for distribution, having been brought up-to-date.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Can you run through the table of contents very quickly?

[] The basic Agency Notices on the Career Service, the Personnel Notices appointing members to Boards, the minutes and agenda of this Board, of the Professional Selection Panel, of the Honor Awards Board, the technique and practice in personnel evaluation reports, basic intelligence training regulations, and then copies of the minutes of the other 20 Boards.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Did everybody who wants a copy raise their hands? Colonel Baird? The DD/I and the DD/A?

[] It's all ready for you. It's all ready for distribution to all members of the Board. I don't want to load you down with something that would not be useful.

[] I think we should have one copy.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: One to Commo, Training, DD/I, DD/P and DD/A, and that will take care of it.

[] We have them all.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The last item is the tabulation of staff employee career designations. I think you have that with your papers. Are there any comments on this?

Is there any other business?

CONFIDENTIAL

Thank you, gentlemen, we will stand adjourned.

. . . The meeting then adjourned at 5:00 p.m. . . .

CONFIDENTIAL